
REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 18, 20 and 22-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-9. Applicants' representative notes with appreciation Examiner's allowance of claims 9-11, 18, 20, 24-29, as well as the indication by Examiner that claims 8 and 12 would be allowable if recast in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1 and 23 have therefore been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 8 and intervening claim 7. In addition, claim 12 has been amended to cure minor informalities. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 7, 22 and 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-4, 7, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock (U.S. 2,520,204) in view of Nashiki (U.S. 5,039,900). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 1 and 23 have been amended herein to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in claims 7-8. As the Examiner notes, both Hancock and Nashiki fail to recite *an electromagnetic coil supported within the second side of the integral field cup and front end shield, and a compression spring disposed between the armature plate and the electromagnetic coil*. Support for the amendment can be found throughout the specification, in particular at page 6, line 9-10. In view of the foregoing, it is now believed that claims 1-4, 7, 22 and 23 are now in condition for issuance, and that this rejection should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 5 and 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock (U.S. 2,520,204) in view of Nashiki (U.S. 5,039,900) as applied to claims 1-4, 7, 22 and 23, and further in view of Rossi (U.S. 4,811,820). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Claims 5 and 6 depend from

independent claim 1 that is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and Rossi, as indicated by Examiner, does not make up for the deficiencies inherent in Hancock and Nashiki with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and issuance of claims 5 and 6 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone: (216) 696-8730
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731